

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
MACON DIVISION**

CURTIS HUNTER,

Plaintiff,

V.

**RIVERBEND CORRECTIONAL
FACILITY, et al.,**

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:19-cv-491 (MTT)

ORDER

Pro se Plaintiff Curtis Hunter has moved the Court to reconsider its Order granting Defendants' request for extension of time to file their motion for summary judgment (Doc. 81). Doc. 82. Hunter's motion is without merit.

Pursuant to Local Rule 7.6, “Motions for Reconsideration shall not be filed as a matter of routine practice.” M.D. Ga. L.R. 7.6. Indeed, “[r]econsideration of a previous order is an extraordinary remedy to be employed sparingly.” *Bingham v. Nelson*, 2010 WL 339806, at *1 (M.D. Ga. Jan. 21, 2010) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). It “is appropriate only if the movant demonstrates (1) that there has been an intervening change in the law, (2) that new evidence has been discovered which was not previously available to the parties in the exercise of due diligence, or (3) that the court made a clear error of law.” *Id.*

Hunter argues the Court made a “clear error of law” in granting Defendants’ extension request. *See generally* Doc. 87. A timely motion to extend is reviewed for good cause, not excusable neglect. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b). But such motions “should be liberally granted absent a showing of bad faith ... or undue prejudice.” *Lizarazo v.*

Miami-Dade Corr. & Rehab. Dep't, 878 F.3d 1008, 1012 (11th Cir. 2017) (internal citations omitted). Under this liberal standard, the Court properly granted Defendants' requested fourteen-day extension. See Doc. 81. In any event, the extension does not constitute undue delay, nor does it prejudice Hunter. Accordingly, Hunter's motion for reconsideration (Doc. 87) is **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED, this 4th day of November, 2021.

S/ Marc T. Treadwell
MARC T. TREADWELL, CHIEF JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT